



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 22d, 1867.

THE Society met at the usual time and place, and was called to order by the President soon after 10 o'clock.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, it was voted, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of Arrangements, to adjourn the morning session about 1 o'clock, to re-assemble at 4 o'clock, at Dr. Peabody's, in Cambridge, and to adjourn at 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation kindly tendered by Dr. Peabody, to take tea socially with a few friends at his house.

The Treasurer's Report was presented, audited, and accepted. It showed the receipts and expenditures of the year to have been as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866,	-	-	-	-	-	\$504.12
Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year,	\$410.00					
do. do. for other years,	185.00	595.00				
Sale of the Journal,	-	-	-	-	6.00	
Total receipts of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	601.00
						\$1,105.12

EXPENDITURES.

Binding books,	-	-	-	-	-	\$21.25
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	-	-	-	-	-	34.11
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	\$55.36
Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867,	-	-	-	-	-	1,049.76
						\$1,105.12

The Librarian made a brief statement respecting the additions to the library and cabinet during the past year, and said that the full acknowledgments would be printed along with the Proceedings at this meeting (see below).

The Committee of Publication reported that, owing to unfavorable circumstances, nothing had been issued from the press by the Society during the past year; it was hoped that the printing of Vol. ix of the Journal would soon be begun: the Tāttiriya-Prāṭicākhya, text, commentary, translation, and notes, was expected to occupy a considerable part of it, as already some time since announced. In view of the intermission of any issue of the Journal since the last annual meeting, the Committee had recommended that no annual assessment be levied upon the members for the year 1867-8, and this recommendation had been considered and approved by the Directors, and was, by their authority, presented to the Society for acceptance.

Hereupon, on motion, the recommendation was accepted by the Society, and the assessment for the year suspended.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the autumn meeting to be held in New Haven, on Wednesday, Oct. 16th, 1867, unless

the Committee of Arrangements—Prof. Salisbury of New Haven, Mr. Cotheal of New York, and the Corresponding Secretary—should see reason to fix on some other day in the same month. Also, that they had designated Prof. Hadley of New Haven and Mr. J. H. Trumbull of Hartford, with the Corresponding Secretary, a committee to examine, at the request of Prof. Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, an ethnological essay by Mr. L. H. Morgan of Rochester, on systems of consanguinity, and to report upon its worthiness to be accepted for publication by the Institution.

The following gentlemen, recommended by the Directors, were elected Corporate Members of the Society:

Rev. Edson L. Clark, of Guilford, Conn.

Mr. John Fiske, of Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Charles M. Mead, of Andover, Mass.

Announcement was made to the meeting, by the Corresponding Secretary, of the Society's loss by death during the past year of three of its members, Rev. Dr. William Jenks of Boston, Rev. Dr. William Goodell, late of the Constantinople mission of the A.B.C.F.M., and Mr. Theodore Dwight of Brooklyn.

Rev. Dr. Anderson, of Boston, gave a sketch of the life and labors of Dr. Jenks. With him, as much as, or more than, with any other person, originated the idea of the American Oriental Society, one of whose Vice-Presidents he had been from its inception in 1842, although now long prevented by deafness from taking an active part in its deliberations. He was born in 1778. He held for some years the Professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College. His chief literary work was the compilation of the Comprehensive Commentary. He was a man of profound learning and extensive reading, and his private library, thirty years ago, was reputed one of the best in New England.

Dr. Parker, of Washington, also spoke of the services rendered by Dr. Jenks to various departments of learning and philanthropic effort.

Rev. Dr. Clark, of Boston, paid the merited tribute to the worth of the venerable Dr. Goodell, who had finished his missionary labors in the East a year or two since, and returned to pass a brief remnant of life among his friends at home.

Rev. Mr. Syle, of Pelham, N. Y., spoke briefly and with much feeling of the character of Mr. Dwight, his devotion to every good work, and his services as for a long time Secretary of the American Ethnological Society.

Out of the remarks of Dr. Parker grew a discussion of the recent progress of western ideas and institutions in China and Japan, in which, besides himself, Rev. Mr. Syle, and Rev. Dr. Pitkin, of Buffalo, took a part.

Mr. J. S. Ropes, Dr. Clark, and Prof. Hoppin were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the next year. Pres. Woolsey desired to decline a nomination for re-election as President, but was prevailed upon by the general remonstrances of the members present to withdraw his objections. The following ticket was offered by the committee, and elected without dissent:

<i>President</i> —Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D.,	of New Haven.
<i>Vice-Presidents</i> { Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D.D.,	“ Boston.
Hon. PETER PARKER, M.D.,	“ Washington.
Prof. EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	“ New Haven.
<i>Corresp. Secretary</i> —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, Ph.D.,	“ New Haven.
<i>Secr. of Classical Section</i> —Prof. JAMES HADLEY,	“ New Haven.
<i>Recording Secretary</i> —Mr. EZRA ABBOT,	“ Cambridge.
<i>Treasurer</i> —Prof. D. C. GILMAN,	“ New Haven.
<i>Librarian</i> —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	“ New Haven.
Mr. A. I. COTHEAL,	“ New York.
Prof. W. W. GOODWIN, Ph.D.,	“ Cambridge.
Prof. W. H. GREEN, D.D.,	“ Princeton.
<i>Directors</i> { Prof. J. J. OWEN, D.D.,	“ New York.
Prof. A. P. PEABODY, D.D.,	“ Cambridge.
Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	“ Boston.
Prof. JOHN PROUDFIT, D.D.,	“ New York.

Communications were next called for.

1. Rev. N. G. Clark, D.D., Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., read extracts from a letter lately received from Rev. O. P. Allen, Missionary at Kharpût, relative to certain ruins in Kurdistan, north of Diarbekir. The letter bears date of Nov. 5th, 1866. Mr. Allen says:

Our road to-day leads out of the valley in which Hazro is built, and we come out upon the highlands of the Diarbekir plain. We are now entering the Koordish speaking region. We stopped awhile at Hashtar, an Armenian village of fifty or sixty houses, where they know only Koordish. Passing by Bulbul and Atsha and other villages, we reached Farkin early in the afternoon. This was once a large city. It was surrounded by a wall which is still standing, being broken down in only a few places. The foundation is built of round stones, but the upper portion of huge hewn stones. The Armenians of the place all speak Koordish, and know scarcely anything of Christianity. This will be one of the first places to occupy as an outstation. We went over some of the ruins, having with us Consul Taylor's pamphlet giving an account of his explorations. We first went to the southeastern corner, where is a stately pile of ruins, said to have been built by St. Marutha over the graves of the christian martyrs slain by the Persian king Shapur. It was once a beautiful building, and seems intended rather as a monument than for a church. The outside walls and some of the pillars and arches are still standing. Other columns two and a half feet in diameter, of porphyry, beautifully polished, had fallen. The capitals of the columns are singular, looking exactly like a basket of wicker work set on the top of a column. These were finely carved from a softer kind of stone. There are many other buildings near this, but so broken down that we could not determine what they were. The ground about the monument church is thickly laid with grave stones. Passing on around the eastern end, the wall is double, and in a good state of preservation. There are many inscriptions, but none of very ancient date, it is said. An extensive ruin at the north-east corner looks like an old palace. Considerable space inside the walls is cultivated. At the western side is a beautiful mosque, which, from an inscription read by Mr. Taylor, seems to have been built in the year 624 of the Hejira or 1213 of our area, by Modhuffer ed Deen Ghazi, nephew of Sel-lah ed Deen, or Saladin, as he is usually called. The most interesting ruin was an old christian church which seemed much older than the mosque. Its walls, 3 feet thick, are made of large blocks of hewn stone. Three sides are standing. The two gable ends show that it had a slanting roof, like the Grecian temples. A portion of the eastern wall is semi-circular, to form a space for the pulpit or altar. This space was frescoed, probably, as the stones are fitted to hold the plaster. Above this is a beautifully carved cornice. The capitals are the real Corinthian, carved in stone. Its interior width is 75 feet, its length 108 feet, its height

to the eaves about 30 feet. But we could not examine the ruins as we would gladly have done, as we had only a couple of hours where one would need to spend weeks to examine all there is to be seen. Another object of interest is a watch tower, about 100 feet high, some distance from the present walls, said to have been built by Saladin's nephew. It overlooks a valley in which an enemy might have approached the city unobserved but for this tower. The present ruins appear to have been built since the christian era, but the mounds and scattered stones outside the city indicate a much earlier date. Some geographers suppose this to be the ancient Carthiocerta.

Out of the remarks upon this paper grew a discussion respecting the advisability and value of archaeological, literary, and scientific investigations made by missionaries in their various fields of labor. Part was taken in the discussion by Dr. Anderson, Dr. Pitkin, Rev. Mr. Syle, Mr. Ropes, and Prof. Whitney. The opinion was unanimously expressed that such investigations, undertaken and carried on as opportunity offered, in the intervals of missionary work, were of very high importance in their bearing on the culture and freshness and activity of mind of the missionary himself, on his relation to the people and conditions among which his lot was cast, and on the general public—both in the way of direct enlightenment, and by attracting attention, admiration, and sympathy to the missionary cause and its representatives. Reference was made to the immense amount of valuable contributions to knowledge which had been brought before the world by missionaries, to their abundant labors in connection with this Society, as recorded in its Journal, and to the honorable estimation in which American missionaries were held everywhere by reason of these and other similar labors. It was thought that only the narrowest and least enlightened apprehension of the missionary work, could find ground for aught but praise and satisfaction in the literary and scientific activity of the missionaries.

2. On the Niobe of Mt. Sipylus, by Rev. H. J. Van Lennep, D.D., Missionary in Syria of the A. B. C. F. M.; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Van Lennep first rehearses the myth of Niobe, turned to stone upon Mt. Sipylus, as related by Homer and the other classic writers. He then gives a description of the mountain and its surroundings, and goes on to describe a journey which he made near it last autumn, in the course of which he observed and visited the remarkable and ancient work which he regards as Niobe's image. The situation is about five miles east of Magnesia, upon the highroad which skirts the mountain, and at the first *café*. There is a pond at the base of the mountain, and directly above it, about four hundred feet up, is an artificially smoothed wall of rock, in which is sunk a double niche, containing the colossal bust upon a pedestal, cut in very high relief—the whole much defaced, but still plainly recognizable. The rock is a hard white marble, with occasional blue veins, and one of these veins "begins at the region of the eyes, covers the lower part of the face, trickles down the neck and breast, and, falling upon the pedestal, there divides into two broad streams, which flow down to the platform beneath, perfectly representing the pouring of a dark-colored flood of tears."

Mr. Van Lennep quotes the passages of Pausanias, Strabo, etc., referring to the Niobe, and argues that their descriptions are applicable to this monument.

He also encloses a sketch of the monument and its immediate surroundings, taken from a little distance at its left.

3. On the old Egyptian Chronicle, by Dr. Charles Pickering, of Boston.

Dr. Pickering presented some of the main features of this document, with chronological conclusions of his own founded upon it.

Hon. J. D. Baldwin pointed out that the chronicle in question was by the best authorities, such as Lepsius, regarded as spurious, and that he fully concurred in their opinion.

4. On the rendering of the word God in Chinese, by Pres. Woolsey, of Yale College.

This was an essay on the Chinese equivalents for our word God which have been used by Christian missionaries. A historical account was first given of the terms adopted by the Catholics, from Ricci's time until the settlement of the disputes in relation to that matter at Rome near the beginning of the 18th century. Then the views of the Protestant missionaries in China were noticed, the decision of the American Bible Society in favor of *Shin* and against *Shang-ti* in 1850, the continuance of a part of the missionaries to use *Shang-ti* in their versions, and the rise in recent years of an opinion on the part of some very able translators in favor of *Tien-chu*. A comparison was then instituted between these three terms. It was claimed that *Tien-chu*—the term adopted by early catholic teachers and authorized at Rome—had no shade of heathenish or pantheistic thought attached to it, and was well understood through China, as the term in use to denote the supreme object of christian worship. At the same time it was admitted that *Tien-chu* was not properly a translation of the original words used for God in the Bible. The term *Shin* was next examined, and it was shown from printed statements of Messrs. Hartwell and Peet, as well as from the testimony of other missionaries, that it is far too vague to take the place of God in general, although, as most concede, it cannot be wholly dispensed with. Next, *Shang-ti* was discussed at considerable length, in connection with the disputes of the Jesuit and other Catholic preachers, and with the Chinese religious philosophy. The essay of the honest and able Jesuit, Langobardi, who condemned *Shang-ti* and strove to show that the Chinese were atheistic (or, as we should say, pantheistic) in their view of the universe, not only in modern times but, from the very origin of Chinese speculation, was cited with approbation. The opinions also of modern writers on philosophy, of Schelling, and especially Wuttke in his *Geschichte des Heidenthums*, were made use of to corroborate the position taken by the author of the essay, that *Shang-ti*, as properly denoting heaven personified, a conception of naturalism and of pantheism, was an unsafe representative of the scriptural idea of God. On the whole then, *Shang-ti* being condemned, and *Shin* as a leading term pronounced too vague and general, *Tien-chu* had the preference given to it.

Extended remarks were made upon this paper and its subject by Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Syle, both of whom agreed with the writer in his definitive rejection of *Shang-ti*, but thought more favorably than he of *Shin*, and less favorably of *Tien-chu*.

5. On the views of Prof. Key and M. Oppert respecting Sanskritic and Indo-European Philology, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

In this paper Prof. Whitney defended the current methods and commonly accepted results of comparative philology against the attacks of Prof. Key (in the *Transactions of the Philological Society of London*, 1862-3) and M. Oppert (in the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne* for 1866). He began with pointing out the nature and grounds of the dependence of general linguistic science upon Indo-European philology, and of the latter upon Sanskrit study, the limits to this dependence, and its liability to misapprehension and exaggeration by incautious or ill-informed students. The faults of detail which Mr. Key indicates in the work of particular scholars, as Müller and Bopp, do not affect their general philological method, and if his own basis of scholarship had been so extended as to embrace a good knowledge of Sanskrit, he might have been able to criticize their work from a higher point of view, separating its sound from its unsound portions, and duly estimating both. While many of his objections are well taken, others are insufficiently founded, and cannot be maintained. M. Oppert's assault is one of much more serious intent, but much weaker substance and result. He fully accepts the Boppian method, even going so far as to maintain that Bopp has exhausted the whole field of linguistic science, leaving nothing of consequence for others to do after him: but its conclusions he allows to be grammatical only, refusing them any value as historical or ethnological data; he strongly condemns also the introduction of any elements of the new historical philology into the methods of classical instruction. His conception of the scope, bearings, and condition of the science is as far as possible out of the way. He is not a general skeptic as to ethnological connections, as might be expected from his denial of the accepted sources of information respecting them: on the contrary, he puts forth the most detailed and definite state-

ments about the derivation and composition of the Indo-European races, in general and in particular; but they are mere *dicta*, resting upon no assignable basis, and in no small part explainable as the conversions of doubtful or half-understood hypotheses of linguists, drawn from linguistic data, into absolute facts. A main, if not the main, object of the essay is to deny that there is any race-connection, any tie of common descent, between the various nations speaking the branches of Indo-European language: the author does not attempt to disprove the connection, but treats it as a palpably unsound and absurd dogma; but his allusions show that he regards the exceptional propagation of the Latin and Arabic as, by their analogy, sufficiently accounting for the extension of Indo-European language over half a world of heterogeneous tribes. The analogy, however, is a wholly insufficient and inapplicable one, as was attempted to be shown by an inquiry into the causes of the spread of Latin and Arabic, and an indication of their absence in the ancient history of Indo-European speech. M. Oppert's essay is, from its beginning to its end, a tissue of misrepresentations, unwarranted assumptions, and unsound inferences, and cannot but seriously damage his reputation as a linguistic and ethnological scholar.

6. On Chinese Chronology, by Rev. E. Burgess, of South Franklin, Mass.

Mr. Burgess, basing himself mainly upon the discussions of the subject in the introduction to the last volume of Dr. Legge's edition of the Chinese Classics, attempted to show the unauthentic character of the accepted Chinese chronology in its earlier period, previous to the time of Confucius.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet again in New Haven in October next.